REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 1-12 are respectfully requested.

With regard to the present amendments, the current amendments to the claims are intended to recite that the claimed features are end system features. These amendments further emphasize that which is already recited in the preamble of independent Claim 1, from which Claims 2-12 depend, that is "A distributed firewall (DFW) for use on an end system." No new subject matter is intended to be added by these amendments. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The rejection of Claims 1, 5, and 7-12 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Nessett, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,968,176; hereafter "Nessett") has been repeated. The Applicant respectfully maintains its traversal to this rejection, and further maintains its request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Once again, as emphasized by the present amendments to the claims, the Applicant respectfully submits that Nessett fails to teach every element of Claim 1, from which the remainder of Claims 5 and 7-12 depend, as required by MPEP §2131, which states, in part:

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set fort in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

In particular, the distributed firewall (DFW) of Claim 1 recites, in part, "an end system access control component for providing purpose authorization for authenticated users based on rules in a connection policy associating users with purposes." The Applicant submits that this feature is not described, expressly or inherently, by Nessett. More specifically, to support the assertion of anticipation with regard to the "end system access control component" of Claim 1, the rejection references Nessett, column 12, lines 10, 11,

and 17-19; and Nessert, column 16, lines 6-10. However, the modem described in column 12 provides firewall functionality in network-based access servers, and the network interface card (hereafter "NIC") described in columns 12 and 16 enforce security rules supported by a network-based server. Thus, neither the network-based modem nor network-supported NIC described Nessett anticipate the presently claimed end system access control component.

Further, Nessert fails to teach, or suggest, the claimed "end system enforcement component." Rather, as described on column 16, lines 10-12, Nessett describes filtering rules that are installed to and applied by an access server.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the network-based firewall system described by Nessett fails to anticipate the "distributed firewall (DFW) for use on an end system" (emphasis added) recited in Claim 1. Based on their dependency upon Claim 1, it is further submitted that Claims 5 and 7-12 are similarly distinguishable over Nessett.

For at least the reasons advanced above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The rejection of Claims 2-4 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nessett in view of Harkins, *et al.* (RFC 2409, "The Internet Key Exchange"; hereafter "Harkins") has also been repeated. The Applicant respectfully maintains its traversal to this rejection as well, and further maintains its request that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

In particular, Claims 2-4 depend from Claim 1, either directly or indirectly; and Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Nessett for at least the reasons set forth above, particularly in view of the current amendments. With further regard to independent Claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that Harkins does not provide any teachings that are able

to compensate for the above-described deficiencies of Nessett. Specifically, Harkins does not teach or suggest the end system features that are presently claimed, nor is such an assertion made in the rejection.

Therefore, based on their dependency upon Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 2-4 are distinguishable over Nessett and Harkins, both singularly and in combination together. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

The remaining references of record have been studied. It is respectfully submitted that they do not compensate for the deficiencies of the references cited to reject Claims 1-12.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early and forthright issuance of a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
MICROSOFT CORPORATION

Date: December 07, 2005

By _____
David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222
Direct Phone No.: 425-703-8092

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with US Postal Service on the date shown below to; Mail Stop AF Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

December 07, 2005

_____
Signature

David S. Lee
Type or Print Name